



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/521,624	01/14/2005	Tatsuya Igarashi	450100-05082	2019
7590 William S Frommer Frommer Lawrence & Haug 745 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10151				
06/13/2008				
EXAMINER				
KHANNA, MADHU				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2151				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/13/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/521,624

Applicant(s)

IGARASHI ET AL.

Examiner

MADHU KHANNA

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 March 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 January 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to Amendment filed 03/05/2008 under 37 C.F.R. §1.111, claims 1-11 have been amended. Claims 1-11 remain pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. Applicants arguments regarding the consideration of JP 3-123137, included in Applicants' IDS dated 01/14/2005 has been considered. The Applicants have met the requirements and the prior art has therefore been considered.

Specification

3. Regarding the objection to the specification, Applicants amendments to the inconsistency obviates previously raised objection, as such objections are hereby withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. Applicant's amendments to claim 1 in response to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, has been considered. The amendment to the claim obviates previously raised objection, as such this rejection is hereby withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. Applicants amendments to claim 11 in response to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101, has been considered. The amendment to the claim obviates previously raised objection, as such this rejection is hereby withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. Quotation of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action may be found in the previous office action.

7. Claims 1, 4-6, and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trisno et al. (US 7,096,257) in view of Barret (US 6,832,321), in further view of Shaked et al. (US 2002/0007411) and in further view of Kagawa (US 2002/0169937).

Regarding claim 1, Trisno teaches

a memory section for storing an address table (column 2 lines 58-60) in which one or more manually (e.g. by administrator or other) registered client addresses (e.g. network address) (column 7 lines 32-34) and one or more automatically registered client addresses (column 2 lines 51-55) are registered in forms to distinguish each other (e.g. recognizes the network addresses that have been manually configured, column 7 lines 41-45); however, although Trisno teaches nodes coupled on a network being configured with addresses, Trisno does not teach registration modes "access control modes", wherein said modes, one allows a client/node to manually register a MAC

address and another mode allows a client/node to automatically register a MAC address.

Barrett teaches an information processing apparatus (access server) for executing an access control process, comprising:

an access control section ("Firewall Options" dialog box) for executing different access control processes (e.g. the predefined security settings include a setting in which all inbound connections are blocked, a setting in which inbound connections from unknown addresses are blocked, and a setting in which all inbound connections are allowed), in response to an access request from a client (inbound connection) (column 8 lines 20-35), in accordance with an access control mode (security settings) set in the information processing apparatus (maintained by an access server) (column 5 lines 51-59), wherein the access control mode is an automatic registration access control mode or a manually registered device access control mode (the security level field indicates that the allowed list should be consulted, column 9 lines 55-56); and

the access control section has a structure in that:

if the access control mode (security setting) is set as the manually registered device access control mode (the security level field indicates that the allowed list should be consulted), the access control process is executed under the condition that the one or more addresses of the access requesting client (packet making the request) are registered in the address table as one or more manually registered addresses (allowed list) (column 9 lines 55-62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention given the system/method of Trisno for assigning the nodes in a network an address, the teachings of Barrett for controlling which outside connection requests are allowed access to the nodes and network. One would be motivated to combine these teachings because in doing so the network of nodes would be secure by allowing a user to restrict outside access to only desired devices and/or clients. However, although the above prior art does teach the access control mode (security setting) set in said information processing apparatus (access server) is automatic registration access control mode (Barrett: if such a request is received by the access server, the destination address of the outside computer is added to a list of destination addresses with which the client computer has established outbound connections (referred to as the "previous connections list"), column 8 line 59-67 - column 9 lines 1-4); Trisno-Barrett do not teach the automatic registration access control mode being executed as a result of an access request.

Kagawa teaches one or more MAC addresses of an access requesting client (source MAC address of a packet is inputted, [0029]) are registered until the number of MAC addresses reaches a defined limit number of registration (when available memory space exists in the four accessed memory areas, the source MAC address is registered as a new address [0033]), and the access control process is executed under the condition of the registration process (steps S201-S206 in Fig. 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention given the desirability of Trisno-Barrett to efficiently assign addresses

to nodes on a network and protect these nodes by limiting access to select outside devices based on various security levels, the teachings of Kagawa for improving management of a table containing information regarding the outside devices. One of ordinary skill pertaining network access would recognize that maintaining an updated list of MAC addresses, or any other type of address identifier, accessing the network would allow for improved security preferences. One would be motivated to combine these teachings because in doing so the access server could better manage security setting by utilizing the information of an organized table which uses hashing to store information regarding each devices address. However, although the above mentioned prior art teaches an environment where addresses are automatically assigned, and embodiments where an address is manually assigned, the above prior art does not explicitly disclose changing an automatically registered address to a manually registered address in the address table.

Shaked teaches a registration processing section for executing a setting change process for changing an entry to the one or more manually registered addresses (updated manually whenever network address assignments change) in the address table (look-up table) [0034].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to utilize manual updating of registered addresses in the system/method of Trisno-Barrett-Kagawa as suggested by Shaked in order to easily modify address information in a stored table. One would be motivated to combine these teachings because if an administrator was not satisfied with the automatic registration of

a node, allowing the administrator to manually change this registration improves the functionality of the system by permitting a simple means for an administrator to implement his/her preferences.

Regarding claim 4, the information processing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein:

the registration processing section a process for registering the one or more client (node) addresses (Trisno: network addresses for one or more of the nodes are manually configured, column 7 lines 32-34) in the address table as one or more manually registered client addresses (Trisno: set the network address with the manually configured network address, column 7 lines 37-41) under the condition that a manual registration process in accordance with a predefined address registration process sequence is executed (Trisno: manually configuration by a network administrator or other user, column 7 lines 32-34).

Regarding claim 5, the information processing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein:

the registration processing section executes the setting change when a manual registration process in accordance with a predefined address registration process sequence is executed for the one or more MAC addresses registered as the one or more automatically registered client addresses in the address table (Trisno: the network addresses for one or more of the nodes are manually configured by a network administrator or other user, column 7 lines 32-34).

Regarding claim 6, this method claim comprises limitation(s) substantially the same as those discussed on claim 1 above, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 9, this method claim comprises limitation(s) substantially the same as those discussed on claim 4 above, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 10, this method claim comprises limitation(s) substantially the same as those discussed on claim 5 above, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 11, this computer program claim comprises limitation(s) substantially the same as those discussed on claim 1 above, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

8. Claims 2 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trisno-Barrett-Kagawa-Shaked in view of Renda et al. (US 7,127,524).

Regarding claim 2, Trisno-Barrett-Kagawa-Shaked teach the information processing apparatus according to claim 1, characterized in that:

if the access control mode (Barrett: security settings) is set as the automatic registration access control mode,

said access control section registers the one or more MAC addresses of the client up to the defined limit number of registration (Kagawa: when available memory space exists in the four accessed memory areas, the source MAC address is registered as a new address [0033]), and executes the access control process for allowing access from the client under the condition of the registration process (Kagawa: S201-S206 of FIG. 3). However, although Trisno-Barrett-Kagawa teach identifying the type of access request by disclosing that the user can specify certain types of connections to block or allow (Barrett: column 8 lines 37-42), Trisno-Barrett-Kagawa do not teach registering the address only if the access request corresponds to the type of request to which access control should be executed.

Renda teaches identifying the type of access request (target corresponds to what the user is trying to do) from the client (user) and registers the one or more addresses (action) of the client up to only in the case where the type of the identified access request (target) corresponds to the type of access request (target) to which access control should be executed (action) (certain privileges for a user have a target and an action, column 8 lines 59-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention given the system/method of Trisno-Barrett-Kagawa for improving management of access to a network of nodes by giving the user a range of security levels and maintaining an functional table of device MAC addresses associated with the network, the teachings of Renda for improved control of access to a network. One of ordinary skill would recognize that intercepting client device requests to verify privileges

based on the sending devices address before forwarding the request to their destinations would further filter undesired access to the network while additionally having the option of forwarding the request to an alternative destination. One would be motivated to combine these teaching because in doing so the security of network access based on a table of MAC addresses would be enhanced by giving the administrator more options regarding how requests are handled or redirected if the client devices privileges are not sufficient to grant the request.

Regarding claim 7, this method claim comprises limitation(s) substantially the same as those discussed on claim 2 above, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

9. Claims 3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trisno-Barrett-Kagawa-Shaked-Renda in view of Fielding et al. (Hypertext Transfer Protocol – HTTP/1.1) (referred to as RFC 2616 hereafter).

Regarding claim 3, Trisno-Barrett-Kagawa-Shaked-Renda teach said type of access request to which said access control should be executed includes at least one of a content request process based on an HTTP (Hyper Text Transfer Protocol) method and a control request process based on a SOAP (Simple Object Access Protocol) (Renda: targets having a destination port corresponding to the HTTP protocol, column 23 lines

40-41). However, Trisno-Barrett-Kagawa-Shaked-Renda do not teach the HTTP content request process being based on exclusively the HTTP-GET method.

RFC 2616 teaches the HTTP-GET (The GET method means retrieve whatever information is identified by the Request-URL, section 9.3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the claimed invention given the teachings of Trisno-Barrett-Kagawa-Renda for regulating network access for requests based on HTTP protocol, the teachings of RFC 2616 regarding HTTP-GET. One of ordinary skill would recognize that the HTTP-GET is a standard method utilized for HTTP requests and therefore would be motivated to combine these teaching.

Regarding claim 8, this method claim comprises limitation(s) substantially the same as those discussed on claim 3 above, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments, filed 03/05/2008, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 6 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Applicants amendments.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MADHU KHANNA whose telephone number is (571)270-3629. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8:30-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. K./
Examiner, Art Unit 2151

/Salad Abdullahi/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2157